

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ALIREZA NASSER,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 24-2081-TL

V.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

UR JADDOU, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Plaintiff has filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) in the entitled action. (Dkt. # 3.) In the IFP application, Plaintiff reports a net monthly income of along with \$200 in cash on hand, \$3,930 in a checking account, and \$1,500 in a savings account. (*Id.* at 1.) He reports no valuable property or dependents, and incurs monthly expenses of \$625. (*Id.* at 2.) Over the past twelve months, he has also received \$9,600 from rent, interest, dividends, and \$2,527.47 from other benefits. Plaintiff states that his income is below the poverty level. (*Id.*)

The district court may permit indigent litigants to proceed IFP upon completion of a proper affidavit of indigence. *See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).* “To qualify for in forma pauperis status, a civil litigant must demonstrate both that the litigant is unable to pay court fees and that the

1 claims he or she seeks to pursue are not frivolous.” *Ogunsalu v. Nair*, 117 F. App’x 522, 523
 2 (9th Cir. 2004), cert. denied, 544 U.S. 1051 (2005). To meet the first prong of this test, a litigant
 3 must show that he or she “cannot because of his [or her] poverty pay or give security for the
 4 costs and still be able to provide him[or her]self and dependents with the necessities of life.”
 5 *Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948) (internal alterations
 6 omitted).

7 Plaintiff’s application omits information necessary for the Court to determine his ability
 8 to pay court fees and costs. Specifically, Plaintiff’s application lacks a clear explanation for why
 9 available funds cannot be used to pay the filing fee of \$405.00. (Dkt. # 3 at 2.) Under these
 10 circumstances, Plaintiff should not be authorized to proceed IFP.

11 Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to show cause by **January 6, 2025**, why the Court
 12 should not recommend his IFP application be denied. Alternatively, Plaintiff may submit an
 13 amended IFP application by that date, explaining his circumstances more fully. The Clerk is
 14 directed to renote Plaintiff’s IFP application (dkt. # 3) for January 6, 2025, and to send copies of
 15 this order to Plaintiff and to the Honorable Tana Lin.

16 Dated this 23rd day of December, 2024.

17 

18 MICHELLE L. PETERSON
 19 United States Magistrate Judge
 20
 21
 22
 23